

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/030,182	<b>Applicant(s)</b> STAHLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dwayne K. Handy	<b>Art Unit</b> 1743	

**All Participants:**

(1) Dwayne K. Handy.

(2) Brian Tollefson.

**Status of Application:** After Final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 July 2007

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*D. Handy*

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Mr. Tollefson 7/13/07 leaving a message informing him that the amendment submitted 6/13/07 would NOT be entered due to what the Examiner believed was an unclear issue in the new claim (112, 2nd Paragraph issue). Applicant then contacted the Examiner to state his belief that this was an error on the Examiner's part. The Examiner later concurred with Applicant that the Examiner had indeed made a mistake and the application would now be Allowed.